



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,798	12/02/2003	John J. Burlingame	J-SLA.1436	6141
55428	7590	08/27/2007	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
ROBERT VARITZ				GE, YUZHEN
4915 SE 33RD PLACE			[REDACTED]	ART UNIT
PORTLAND, OR 97202				PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			[REDACTED]	MAIL DATE
				DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/726,798	BURLINGAME, JOHN J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yuzhen Ge	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to because some handwritten letters are hard to read.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith et al (US Patent 5,999,710).

Regarding claim 1, Smith et al teach a processing method for the staged decompressing and half-toning of a compressed digital image file which is defined by plural data rows comprising

selecting from the image data file a yet un-compressed row region which makes up less than the whole image file (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33),

decompressing the selected row region (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33),

half-toning the decompressed row region (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33),

storing the half-toned row region (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33), and

repeating, seriatim, the selecting, decompressing, half-toning and storing steps until the whole image file has been so processed (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33).

Regarding claim 5, Smith et al teach the process of claim 1, wherein the selected row region includes but a single data row (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33, a jpeg file consists of many rows and each rows corresponds to the variable length or entropy coded compressed 8x8 block).

Regarding claim 6, Smith et al teach the process of claim 1, wherein the selected row region includes plural data rows (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33, a row of blocks is regarded as a row region which includes plural data row).

Claim 7 is the corresponding apparatus claim of claim 1. Smith et al teach an apparatus (Figs. 1 and 5). Thus Smith et al teach claim 7 as evidently explained in the above-cited passages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al in view of Park et al (US Patent 7,098,903 B2).

Regarding claim 2, Smith et al teach the method of claim 1. However they do not explicitly teach where a selected row region is the same as the last previously processed row region, skipping the decompressing step. Park et al teach when a selected row region is the same as the last previously processed row region, skipping the decompressing step and copying the previous decoded row region (col. 3, lines 16-23, col. 5, lines 41-44, Figs. 1 and 4, when scaling up, a selected row region is the same as the last previously processed row region and decompressing step for this row region is not performed). Smith et al teach half-toning and storing the decompressed version of the row region (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33) which is re-half-toning and storing the decompressed version of the last-processed

Art Unit: 2624

row region when the last processed row region is copied. It is desirable to be efficient when processing the image. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, not to decompress the row region which is the same as the last one processed and re-half-toning it and stored it so that unnecessary processing is avoided.

4. Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al in view of Fredlund et al (US Patent 6,549,306).

Regarding claims 3 and 8, Smith et al teach the method of claim 1 and apparatus of claim 7. However they do not explicitly teach the method of claim 1 which further includes, intermediate the decompressing and half-toning steps, the optional step of resizing a just-decompressed row region. In the same field of endeavor, Fredlund et al teach an optional step of resizing a just-decompressed row region intermediate the decompressing and half-toning steps (Fig. 6, 118 is the resizing step, 124 is the half-toning step, col. 7, lines 30-33). It is desirable to let users/customers have the flexibility of ordering prints that satisfy their needs (col. 1, line 28-col. 2, line 27). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to have a re-sizing step after the decompression step so that customers can enlarge or reduce the prints to suit their needs

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al in view of Fredlund et al (US Patent 6,549,306), further in view of Park et al (US Patent 7,098,903 B2). Regarding claim 4, Smith et al and Fredlund et al teach the process of claim 3. However they do not explicitly teach where a selected row region is the same as the last previously decompressed

and optionally resized row region, skipping the decompressing and optional resizing steps. Park et al teach when a selected row region is the same as the last previously processed row region, skipping the decompressing step and copying the previous decoded row region (col. 3, lines 16-23, col. 5, lines 41-44, Figs. 1 and 4, when scaling up, a selected row region is the same as the last previously processed row region and decompressing step for this row region is not performed). Smith et al teach half-toning and storing the decompressed version of the row region (col. 16, lines 6-31, col. 17, lines 16-23, col. 17, lines 58-67, col. 22, lines 51-60, col. 25, lines 1-7, col. 25, lines 46-55, col. 26, lines 42-65, col. 29, lines 6-33) which is re-half-toning and storing the decompressed version of the last-processed row region when the last processed row region is copied. Fredlund et al teach resizing the decompressed row region before the half-toning step (Fig. 6, 118 is the resizing step, 124 is the half-toning step, col. 7, lines 30-33). It is desirable to be efficient when processing the image. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, not to decompress the row region which is the same as the last one processed and re-half-toning it, resizing it and stored it so that unnecessary processing is avoided.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yuzhen Ge whose telephone number is 571-272 7636. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on 571-272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yuzhen Ge
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

**WENPENG CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Wenpeng Chen
6/26/07